



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,160	02/27/2002	Byron A. Alcorn	100110664-1	2666
7590	06/23/2004		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			TUNG, KEE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2676	
DATE MAILED: 06/23/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/086,160	ALCORN, BYRON A.
	Examiner Kee M Tung	Art Unit 2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |
|---|--|

DETAILED ACTION

The response filed 4/13/04 has been considered in preparing this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

2. Claims 10-15, 17-20 and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Humphreys et al (WireGL: A scalable graphics system for clusters, hereinafter “Humphreys”).

Humphreys teaches a distributed resource system (Figs. 1 and 2) comprising a plurality of distributed first resource units (Fig. 2, application stage, Apps) operable to generate a first set of data; a plurality of second resource units (Fig. 2, graphics accelerators or engines, Geom and Rast) operable to generate a second set of data in response to the first set of data; a traffic controller (Fig. 2, image composition network) located remotely from at least one of the plurality of second resource units and communicatively coupled to the plurality of second resource units and operable to collect the second set of data from the plurality of second resource units and synchronize the collected data (paragraph bridge between pages 134-135 and page 134, paragraph bridge between column 1 and column 2, specially, last four lines of the paragraph); and a plurality of display devices (Fig. 2, displays; and page 134, col. 1, first full paragraph, suggests to allow each pipeserver to drive a single locally attached

display) coupled to the traffic controller and operable to receive the synchronized data for display to a plurality of users. Therefore, at least claims 10, 15, 17, 19, 20 and 23-26 anticipated by Humphreys.

As per claim 11, Humphreys teaches the plurality of display devices are coupled to the plurality of first and second resource units via network (Fig. 2, image composition network).

As per claims 12-14 and 27-28, Humphreys teaches the traffic controller is coupled to the plurality of resource units via computer network or Intranet (page 133, col. 2, section 3.3).

As per claim 18, Humphreys teaches the plurality of display devices are located remotely from the plurality of first and second resource units (page 130, col. 1, third full paragraph, suggests communication after the application stage provides a redistribution of primitives to **remote** graphics accelerators).

As per claim 22, Humphreys teaches a data storage means (such as, main memory) coupled to the first resource means (APP or CPU) for storing data.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-35 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-39 of copending Application No. 10/086,060. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because a switching fabric of copending application would have been obvious in view of the network connection of present application since both are considered as a well known connection means in the art.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 4/13/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The rejection has been modified in order to fully consider applicant's arguments. Basically, applicant argues that Humphreys fails to suggest or teach the claimed "synchronization". The examiner disagrees as indicated in the detail rejection above.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kee M Tung whose telephone number is 703-305-9660. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday - Friday from 5:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on 703-308-6829. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kee M Tung
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2676